ABBREVIATED PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

This checklist can be used to help the site investigator determine if an Abbreviated Preliminary Assessment (APA) is warranted. This checklist should document the rationale for the decision on whether further steps in the site investigation process are required under CERCLA. Use additional sheets, if necessary. **Checklist Preparer:** (Name/Title) (Phone) (Address) (E-Mail Address) Site Name: Previous Names (if any): Site Location: (Street) (City) (Zip) Latitude: Longitude: Describe the release (or potential release) and its probable nature: Part 1 - Superfund Eligibility Evaluation If all answers are "no" go on to Part 2, otherwise proceed to Part 3. YES NO 1. Is the site currently in CERCLIS or an "alias" of another site? 2. Is the site being addressed by some other remedial program (Federal, State, or Tribal)? П 3. Are the hazardous substances potentially released at the site regulated under a statutory exclusion (e.g., petroleum, natural gas, natural gas liquids, synthetic gas usable for fuel, normal application of fertilizer, release located in a workplace, naturally occurring, or regulated by the NRC, UMTRCA, or OSHA)? Ø Are the hazardous substances potentially released at the site excluded by policy considerations (i.e., deferred to RCRA corrective action)? 5. Is there sufficient documentation to demonstrate that no potential for a release that could cause adverse Ø environmental or human health impacts exists (e.g., comprehensive remedial investigation equivalent data showing no release above ARARs, completed removal action, previous HRS score determined, or an EPA approved risk assessment completed)? Please explain all "yes" answer(s). 40281770 Superfund

1.0

Part 2 - Initial Site Evaluation

For Part 2, if information is not available to make a "yes" or "no" response, further investigation may be needed. In these cases, determine whether an APA is appropriate. Exhibit 1 parallels the questions in Part 2. Use Exhibit 1 to make decisions in Part 3.

If the answer is "no" to any of questions 1, 2, or 3, proceed directly to Part 3.				
1.	Does the site have a release or a potential to release?			
2.	Does the site have uncontained sources containing CERCLA eligible substances?		. 🖭	
3.	Does the site have documented on-site, adjacent, or nearby targets?		· ·	
	the answers to questions 1, 2, and 3 above were all "yes" then answer the questions below before occeeding to Part 3.	YES	NO	
4.	Does documentation indicate that a target (e.g., drinking water wells, drinking surface water intakes, etc.) has been exposed to a hazardous substance released from the site?			
5.	Is there an apparent release at the site with no documentation of exposed targets, but there are targets on site or immediately adjacent to the site?			
6.	Is there an apparent release and no documented on-site targets or targets immediately adjacent to the site, but there are nearby targets (e.g., targets within 1 mile)?			
7.	Is there no indication of a hazardous substance release, and there are uncontained sources containing CERCLA hazardous substances, but there is a potential to release with targets present on site or in proximity to the site?			
Not	es:			
	- -			
	<u> </u>			

EXHIBIT 1 SITE ASSESSMENT DECISION GUIDELINES FOR A SITE

Exhibit 1 identifies different types of site information and provides some possible recommendations for further site assessment activitibased on that information. You will use Exhibit 1 in determining the need for further action at the site, based on the answers to the questions in Part 2. Please use your professional judgement when evaluating a site. Your judgement may be different from the generarecommendations for a site given below.

Sus	pected/Documented Site Conditions	APA	Full PA	PA/SI	SI	
1.	There are no releases or potential to rele	Yes	No	No	No	
2.	No uncontained sources with CERCLA present on site.	Yes	No	No	No	
3.	There are no on-site, adjacent, or nearby	Yes	No	No	No	
4.	There is documentation indicating that a target (e.g., drinking water	Option 1: APA SI	Yes	No	No	Yes
	wells, drinking surface water intakes, etc.) has been exposed to a hazardous substance released from the site.	Option 2: PA/SI	No	No	Yes	NA
5.	There is an apparent release at the site with no documentation of exposed	Option 1: APA ⇔ SI	Yes	No	No	Yes
	targets, but there are targets on site or immediately adjacent to the site.	Option 2: PA/SI	No	No	Yes	NA
6.	6. There is an apparent release and no documented on-site targets and no documented targets immediately adjacent to the site, but there are nearby targets. Nearby targets are those targets that are located within 1 mile of the site and have a relatively high likelihood of exposure to a hazardous substance migration from the site.			Yes	No	No
7.	There is no indication of a hazardous su are uncontained sources containing CER substances, but there is a potential to relion site or in proximity to the site.	RCLA hazardous	No ·	Yes	No	No

Part 3 - EPA Site Assessment Decision

When completing Part 3, use Part 2 and Exhibit 1 to select the appropriate decision. For example, if the answer to question 1 in Part 2 was "no," then an APA may be performed and the "NFRAP" box below should be checked. Additionally, if the answer to question 4 in Part 2 is "yes," then you have two options (as indicated in Exhibit 1): Option 1 — conduct an APA and check the "Lower Priority SI" or "Higher Priority SI" box below; or Option 2 — proceed with a combined PA/SI assessment.

Check the box that applies based on the conclusions of the APA:								
B	NFRAP		Refer to Removal Program - further site assessi	ment needed				
b`	Higher Priority SI		Refer to Removal Program - NFRAP					
	Lower Priority SI	. 🗆	Site is being addressed as part of another CERO	CLIS site				
☐ Defer to RCRA Subtitle C			Other:					
	Defer to NRC							
Reg	ional EPA Reviewer:	Print Name/Signature	King Rowalden	1-25-0X Date				

	See	attacl	mait		
-					
	···	<u></u>	·		
					,
					
				· ·	·
-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
		·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
					
					•

A-4

A desk-top review was conducted on the site file. The following is a summary of this review:

On November 10, 1988 a "Potential Hazardous Waste Site Identification" (EPA Form 2070-8 (5-80)) was filled out by EPA. This form was filled out to account for the RCRA storage unit (temporary) that was identified. As a result this site was placed into CERCLIS.

When it was determined that there was no further Superfund activity warranted at this site a "Final Strategy Determination Form", (EPA Form T2070-5 (10-79)) was completed. The determination on that form was 'needs no docket PA'.

To account for this activity a decision was made to prepare an Abbreviated Preliminary Assessment. The APA makes a smooth transition from the site being placed into CERCLIS and requiring a site assessment requirement.